

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 3-6 remain in this application as amended herein, claims 2 and 7-10 are cancelled, and claims 11-19 are added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6 and 11-19 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The specification has been amended to correct minor errors. No new matter has been added.

The Amendment proposes to correct a minor error in the drawings by amending the legend in Box S32 of Fig. 9 to read "POWER PLUG IS CONNECTED?". No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 3 because of informalities. Claim 3 has been amended accordingly.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended to correct the informalities.

Turning now to the art rejections, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,889 B1) in view of Ikonen (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,078 B1). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the references.

The Saito patent describes a home network in which various devices, referred to as nodes, are connected to IEEE 1394 information outlets at various locations in the home. A configuration memory within each node stores information regarding the physical location of the node as well as node information, such as a vendor ID, a node capability, and a type or specification of the device. A PC reads and collects

the physical location information and the node information of each node from its configuration memory and then displays this information on a screen. A user can thus remotely control a desired device by selecting its icon to open an input screen and then carrying out operations on the input screen. Alternatively, the PC and the nodes carry out communications using an Internet Protocol (IP). The PC transmits a location query packet as a multicast, and in response, the information outlets transmit reply packets that describe the locations of the nodes connected thereto. (See Figs. 3-6 and 9; col. 7, line 62 - col. 8, line 25; col. 9, line 47 - col. 10, line 26; and col. 11, lines 35-66).

Saito therefore describes the transmission of *location query packets*, rather than querying as to a *power mode*. Further, Saito describes the receipt of *location reply packets* or the collection of *the physical location information and the node information*, rather than determining that a *power mode* is a *power-off mode* when a response is not detected or determining whether *the power mode* is a *power-on mode* or a *standby mode* based on a detected response. Moreover, the physical location information and the node information are *stored information that does not routinely change* during operation of the node, and in fact, would not ordinarily change unless a node is replaced or physically moved. Once the physical location information and the node information of a node are obtained, there is no need to again obtain such information until the node is replaced or physically moved. A person of ordinary skill in the relevant art would therefore not look to the home network of Saito, which relates to obtaining information that does not change during routine operation of a node,

as a suggestion for determining the power mode of an apparatus.

Additionally, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Saito does not teach controlling a display to show whether the power mode of a respective apparatus is the power-on mode, the standby mode, or the power-off mode.

The Ikonen patent describes an integrated display unit in which a video display and other added-on peripheral devices, such as an audio amplifier, speakers, a microphone, a camera or a telephone handset, share a common power supply. The output of the power supply is controlled based on the power consumption state of the integrated display unit which, in turn, is determined by the presence or absence of the horizontal sync signals and/or the vertical sync signals of the video display and by the presence or absence of detected signals that are generated by the peripherals. Specifically, an audio detector detects the presence of audio signals generated by the peripheral devices, a digital signal detector detects whether a USB cable or other digital communications means is connected to the integrated display unit, and one or more PD detectors detect the presence of other signals associated with the peripheral devices. (See Fig. 1; table 3; col. 2, lines 12-24; col. 3, lines 14-23; col. 3, line 59 - col. 4, line 40; and col. 4, line 62 - col. 5, line 14).

Ikonen therefore describes the detection of *signals generated by the operation of the peripheral devices*, rather than a response to a query, and describes using such signals to determine the power consumption state of the *integrated display unit*, rather than the power consumption state of a *respective one of the video display and the peripherals*. The reference

therefore does not suggest *querying* as to a power mode or suggest such *querying* of a *respective one of a plurality* of apparatuses. Further, the patent does not suggest determining that the power mode of the *respective apparatus* is a power-off mode, a power-on mode or a standby mode, does not suggest determining that the power mode of the respective apparatus is the power-off mode *when a response is not detected*, and does not suggest determining whether the power mode of the respective apparatus is the power-on mode or the standby mode *based on the detected response*.

Neither Saito nor Ikonen suggests:

inquiring means for *querying* a *respective one of the plurality of other apparatuses* as to its power mode;

and neither reference suggests:

discriminating means for determining that the power mode of the *respective apparatus* is a power-off mode *when a response from the respective apparatus is not detected*, and when the response is detected, for determining whether the power mode of the *respective apparatus* is a power-on mode or a standby mode *based on the detected response*

as called for in claim 1.

It follows that neither Saito nor Ikonen, whether taken alone or in combination, suggests or contemplates the information processing apparatus defined in claim 1, and claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the references.

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and each further defines and limits the invention set out in the independent claim. Therefore, claims 3 and 4 are likewise patentably distinguishable over the references.

Independent claim 5 is directed to a mode display control method that has limitations that are analogous to the apparatus limitations set out in claim 1. Claim 5 is therefore patentably distinguishable over the references at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 6 is directed to a recording medium recorded with a program for carrying out a mode display control method similar to that defined in claim 5 and is similarly distinguishable over the references at least for the same reasons.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito and Ikonen as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Nio (Japanese Application No. JP 10-155121). Claim 2 has been cancelled.

New claim 11 depends from independent claim 1, new claims 12-15 depend from independent claim 5, and new claims 16-19 depend from independent claim 6, and each is distinguishable over the references at least for the same reasons as the independent claims. Support for claims 11, 13 and 17 is found in Figs. 5 and 7 and on page 13 of the specification, and support for claim 12 is found in Fig. 4 and on page 14 of the specification. Claims 14-15 and 18-19 include limitations similar to those set out in claims 4-5.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

O.I.P.E. USA
MAR 03 2004
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

ANNOTATED SHEET
SHOWING CHANGES

Approved
5/3/04

Fig. 9

